

THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN H. SETTLE

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA**

PACTOOL INTERNATIONAL LTD.,)	CASE NO. 3:06-cv-05367-BHS
)	
Plaintiff,)	DEFENDANT KETT TOOL
)	COMPANY INC.'S MOTION TO
v.)	EXCLUDE THE ADDENDUM TO THE
)	REPORT OF LORRAINE BARRICK
KETT TOOL COMPANY INC., et al.)	AND ANY RELATED TESTIMONY BY
)	HER THERETO
Defendants.)	
)	NOTED ON MOTION CALENDAR:
)	September 16, 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

Without leave of this Court or even a stipulation from the parties, and after the defendants submitted their rebuttal report to plaintiff PacTool International Ltd.'s ("PacTool") proffered report on damages, PacTool unilaterally and astoundingly submits an "addendum" to its original report! Such a practice simply cannot be countenanced by this Court and as such defendant Kett Tool Company Inc. ("Kett") respectfully moves this Court to exclude the "Addendum to Report of Lorraine Barrick" dated August 18, 2011 and any related testimony by her thereto.

II. BACKGROUND

On June 15, 2011, this Court ordered that the deadline for Opening Expert Reports

1 was July 8, 2011, and the deadline for Rebuttal Reports was August 9, 2011. Dkt. 226.

2 On July 9, 2011, PacTool emailed a copy of the original report of Lorraine Barrick
3 and also sent, for delivery on July 11, 2011, a hard copy of that report along with a disk
4 containing documents referenced in that report.

5 On August 4, 2011, PacTool moved to exclude, in its entirety, the Expert Report and
6 Related Testimony of Dr. Albert H. Lyter III. Dkt. 229.

7 On August 9, 2011, in response to the original report of Lorraine Barrick and in
8 accordance with this Court's Order (Dkt. 226), Kett served the Rebuttal Expert Report of
9 Keith A. Hock on PacTool.

10 On August 17, 2011, PacTool sent an "Addendum to Report of Lorraine Barrick,"
11 which was dated August 18, 2011, to defendants, stating:

12 Mr. Hock's report reminded our expert that she
13 inadvertently left out her description of marketing capacity.
14 Here is a brief addendum.

(Ahrens Dec. Ex. A, filed herewith).

15 **III. ARGUMENT**

16 As is clear from the chronology, Ms. Barrick's "Addendum" was woefully and
17 unexplainably late. Her addendum was submitted more than a month after her opening
18 report was due and more than a week after PacTool received defendants' rebuttal to that
19 report. This Court set forth a simple expert report schedule consisting only of Opening and
20 Rebuttal Reports and no other replies, rebuttals, or addendums. For this reason alone, it must
21 be excluded.

22 Moreover, PacTool provides no justification for the extreme tardiness of this
23 addendum. In fact, the proffered reason is almost laughable, namely, that upon reading her
24 opposing expert's rebuttal report, she was reminded "that she inadvertently left out her
25 description of marketing capacity." (Ahrens Decl. Ex. A). Really? Which attorney, which
26

1 expert, which declarant could not, would not, like to say the same thing: “Upon reading or
2 hearing what my opponent has to say to my opening position, I now would like to expand
3 upon my original statement.” Of course if the process is setup to allow for replies, that is one
4 thing, but that was not the process here.

5 Additionally, it is also obvious from the chronology as well as the proffered
6 explanation, that this addendum came after the rebuttal to her report was submitted. In other
7 words, Mr. Hock has never had the opportunity to respond to her now expanded report.

8 Finally, the timing of PacTool’s related actions does cause one to raise an eyebrow.
9 For PacTool submits this untimely, unilateral addendum to correct an admitted deficiency in
10 its damages expert’s report just two weeks *after* it moved this Court to exclude, in its
11 entirety, the Expert Report and Related Testimony of Dr. Albert H. Lyter III regarding
12 forensics for allegedly also being “incomplete.” Dkt. 229. So on the one hand, PacTool
13 seeks to strike and exclude one allegedly incomplete report, a report interestingly that its own
14 expert found complete enough to render a rebuttal report to, but yet feels totally free to
15 unilaterally and without leave or stipulation, to expand its damages expert’s report *after*
16 *service of* and *because of* the responsive rebuttal report. Incredulous.

17 **IV. CONCLUSION**

18 In sum, the “Addendum to Report of Lorraine Barrick” dated August 18, 2011, and
19 any testimony by her in regards thereto should be excluded. In the alternative, if this Court
20 were to allow the addendum (which for consistency sake would warrant a denial of
21 PacTool’s motion to exclude as well, Dkt. 229), Mr. Hock should be allowed an opportunity
22 to respond to her expanded report.

Respectfully Submitted,

KETT TOOL COMPANY, INC.

/s/ John Paul Davis

Gregory F. Ahrens, OH Bar No. 0038627

Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

John Paul Davis, OH Bar No. 0073446

Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

2700 Carew Tower

441 Vine Street

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-2917

(513) 241-2324

Facsimile: (513) 241-6234

jdavis@whepatent.com

gahrens@whepatent.com

Paul Richard Brown, WSBA No. 19357

Karr Tuttle Campbell

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2900

Seattle, WA 98101

(206) 224-8073

pbrown@karrtuttle.com

Attorneys for Defendant

Kett Tool Company Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 1, 2011, the foregoing document was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system and thereby served on all counsel of record via ECF-generated e-mail and notification.

/s/ John Paul Davis

John Paul Davis, OH Bar No. 0073446

Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*